



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,857	09/23/2005	Claudio Zampieri	2005_1196A	4778
513	7590	09/22/2008	EXAMINER	
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 2033 K STREET N. W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021				COLLADO, CYNTHIA FRANCISCA
3618		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
09/22/2008		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
				PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/549,857	ZAMPIERI, CLAUDIO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	CYNTHIA F. COLLADO	3618	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CYNTHIA F. COLLADO. (3) Nils Pedersen.

(2) Darnell Jayne. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 12 September 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 5 and 7.

Identification of prior art discussed: Borel (2001/001,3695) and Hilgarth (6,015,157).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The rational behind the combination of the cited art was discussed. Furthermore the examiner stated to the applicant that she erroneously stated in the action mailed on 4/23/2008, that the affidavits were sufficient to overcome the art rejection of record, which was an oversight on the examiners behalf. It was agreed that the affidavits had not be properly reviewed and evaluated in the office action. No agreement to the claims was reached at that time.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Cynthia F Collado/ Examiner, Art Unit 3618	
--	--